

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1, 7, 8 and 17 are currently being amended.

Claims 18-20 are currently being added.

This amendment and reply amends and adds claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending and adding the claims as set forth above, claims 1-5, 7-12 and 17-20 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7-12 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,459,499 to Tomat in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,974,447 to Cannon et al.; and claims 2, 4-5, 9 and 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomat in view of Cannon et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,069,706 to Kajita et al. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

The Office Action correctly recognizes (on page 3) that Tomat fails to expressly disclose the features concerning the OCR processing on the image data, whereby the Office Action asserts that Cannon shows a communication system performing OCR to generate text information.

Cannon, however, discloses OCR which is performed not at the transceiver side transmitting information, that is, the pager 18 or the terminal 20, but rather at the receiver side receiving the information, that is, the server 22.

In column 4, lines 30-34 of Cannon, it states that: "If a graphical image had text within the image, and the subscriber unit requesting information only had the capability to see

text, then the agent at the server could include a system for optical character recognition and convert the image to text". (emphasis added)

By contrast, according to the features set forth in independent claims 1, 7, 8, and 17, OCR processing is performed at the side transmitting the information, namely by the image processing apparatus.

This clearly distinguishes over the disclosure of Cannon, whereby neither Tomat nor Kajita et al. rectifies these deficiencies of Cannon.

New Claims:

New claims 18-20 have been added to recite features described on page 12, lines 22-29 of the specification, whereby such features provide an additional basis of patentability for those claims.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 8, 2006

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819